

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for her courtesy in extending a telephone interview to the inventor and his Canadian attorney.

During that interview, the main issue discussed was the unsuitability of the inventor's earlier U.S. Patent 5,444,934 as a reference teaching either the detachable securing of a rod to a rod holder or the detachable securing of a handle means to the reel housing body.

As the inventor explained to Examiner Nguyen, his earlier patent erroneously stated that a separate rod could be inserted, in particular in the rod slide 37. This was a complete misstatement by the drafter of the inventor's earlier patent, based on a misunderstanding by that drafter. As explained to the Examiner, the figures, and in particular Figure 3, clearly teach away from this, illustrating that the thumb screw 38 only fastens rod slide 37 and has no function whatsoever with securing rod 15a in rod slide 37. As explained to the Examiner by the inventor, rod 15a is securely mounted within rod slide 37 and not intended to be detached from it. Again, illustrating the misunderstanding by the drafter of that earlier patent, Figures 5, 12 and 14 which allegedly showed different rods inserted "in its place", show no such feature. The drawings, therefore, are accurate and clearly illustrate the invention as originally intended in this earlier patent of the inventor, as not being a system with detachable means for the rod. Where the text of this patent deviates from the drawings, that text clearly is in error and, it is submitted, should not properly be used as a prior teaching of the detachable rod feature of the present invention.

Thus it is submitted that the subject matter of applicant's claim 1 is indeed novel over the proper teachings of applicant's earlier patent.

With respect to the claim 3, it was pointed out during the telephone conversation with Examiner Nguyen that while the Examiner has suggested that the *LaTouche* patent discloses mating engagement means for the handle and reel body, in fact that earlier reference does not teach this. What is taught is a pivoting (not detachable) handle EXTENSION. This can be clearly seen in Figure 6, for example, where the handle is shown by reference numeral 18 is an integral part, and not detachable from, the main body of the device. The extension handle 12 pivots about the end of this handle.

While detachability of the rod and the handle to the reel housing body may seem like relatively unimportant improvements in a fishing rod system, in fact these improvements permit a single reel housing body to be marketed with a wide variety of different rods and handles, so that the manufacturer or retailer can, with a number of basic (different) handles and rods, market a wide variety of different

Appn. No. 10/684,765
Amdt. Dated July 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 5, 2005

types of fishing rods from both the standpoint of cost and construction. Accordingly it is submitted that applicant's invention is a significant one and one which is not taught by the prior art references.

A new independent claim, 25, and dependent claim 26, have been added in which the combination of the detachable handle feature of claim 3 has been added to the detachable rod feature of claim 1.

As well, a new claim 26 specifically defining applicant's clamp ring (reference numeral 54 in for example Figure 6) has been provided. This feature, not found in applicant's earlier patent or indeed any of the prior art references known to the inventor, allows for even more versatility of applicant's invention, permitting replacement of the elongated hollow body (which detachably holds the rod) with the reel housing body. This feature again adds to the versatility of applicant's device since one reel housing body can be used with a variety of elongated bodies/rod holders.

With respect to the Examiner's remaining combinations of *LaTouche*'s earlier patent with *Edwards et al.*, U.S. Patent 3,618,253, and with *Sobel et al.*, U. S Patent 3,447,254, against, respectively, claims 5 and 19 and claim 18, it is submitted that these claims, being dependant upon claims containing allowable subject matter, should similarly be found allowable.

Finally, a clerical correction has been made to paragraph [0030] of the description.

Respectfully submitted,



Derek V. Forinash
Reg. No. 47,231
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P. O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
(713) 238-8000
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT